IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

APRIL 29, 1886.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted the following

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY:

[To accompany S. Res. 5.]

The undersigned minority of the Committee of the Senate on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred Senate Resolution No. 5, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant the right to vote to the women of the United States, beg leave to submit the folfowing minority report, consisting of extracts from a little volume entitléd, "Letters from a Chimney Corner," written by a highly cultivated lady, Mrs. ———, of Chicago. This gifted lady has discussed the question with so much clearness and force that we make no apology to the Senate for substituting quotations from her book in place of anything we might produce. We quote first from chapter 3, which is entitled, "The value of suffrage to women much overestimated."

The fair authoress says:

If women were to be considered in their highest and final estate as merely individual beings, and if the right to the ballot were to be conceded to man as an individual, it might perhaps be logically argued that women also possessed the inherent right to vote. But from the oldest times, and through all the history of the race, has run the glimmer of an idea, more or less distinguishable in different ages and under different circumstances, that neither man nor woman, is, as such, individual; that neither being is of itself a whole, a unit, but each requires to be supplemented by the other before its true structural integrity can be achieved. Of this idea, the science of botany furnishes the most perfect illustration. The stamens on the one hand and the ovary and pistil on the other, may indeed reside in one blossom, which then exists in a married or reproductive state. But equally well, the stamens or male organs may reside in one plant, and the ovary and pistil or female organs may reside in another. In that case, the two plants are required to make one structurally complete organization. Each is but half a plant, an incomplete individual by itself. The life principle of each must be united to that of the other; the twain must be indeed one flesh before the organization is either structurally or functionally complete.

Now, everywhere throughout nature, to the male and female ideal, certain distinct powers and properties belong. The lines of demarkation are not always clear, not always straight lines; they are frequently wavering, shadowy, and difficult to follow; yet on the whole, wherever physical strength, personal aggressiveness, the intellectual scope and vigor which manage vast material enterprises are emphasized, there the masculine ideal is present. On the other hand, wherever refinement, tenderness, delicacy, sprightliness, spiritual acumen, and force are to the fore, there the feminine ideal is represented, and these terms will be found nearly enough, for all practical purposes, to represent the differing endowments of actual men and women. Different powers suggest different activities, and under the division of labor here indicated the control of the state, legislation, the power of the ballot would seem to fall to the share of man. Nor does this decision carry with it any injustice, any robbery of just or natural right to woman. In her hands is placed a moral and spiritual power, far greater than the power of the ballot. In her married or reproductive state, the forming and shaping of human souls in their most plastic period is her destiny. Nor do her labors or her responsibilities end with infancy or childhood. Throughout his en-

tire course, from the cradle to the grave, man is ever under the moral and spiritual influence and control of woman. With this power goes a tremendous responsibility for its true management and use. If woman shall ever rise to the full height of her power and privileges in this direction, she will have enough of the world's work upon her hands without attempting legislation.

It may be argued that the possession of civil power confers dignity, and is of itself a re-enforcement of whatever natural power an individual may possess; but the dignity of womanhood, when it is fully understood and appreciated, needs no such re-enforcement, nor are the peculiar needs of woman such as the law can reach. Whenever laws are needed for the protection of her legal status and rights, there has been found to be little difficulty in obtaining them by means of the votes of men; but the deeper and more vital needs of woman and of society are those which are outside altogether of the pale of the law, and which can only be reached by the moral forces lodged in the hands of woman herself, acting in an enlarged and general capacity. For instance, whenever a man or woman has been wronged in marriage, the law may indeed step in with a divorce; but does that divorce give back to either party the dream of love, the happy home, the prattle of children, and the sweet outlook for future years which were destroyed by that wrong? It is not a legal power which is needed in this case; it is a moral power, which shall prevent the wrong, or, if committed, shall induce penitence, forgiveness, a purer life, and the healing of the wound. This power has been lodged by the Creator in the hands of woman herself, and if she has not been rightly trained to use it there is no redress for her at the hands of the law. The law alone can never compel men to respect the chastity of women. They must first recognize its value in themselves, and by their own courageous and upright living—by living up to the high level of their duties as maidens, wives, and mothers—they must impress men with the beauty and sacredness of purity, and then whatever laws are necessary and available for its protection will be easily obtained, with a certainty, also, that they can be enforced, because the moral sentiments of men will be enlisted in their support.

Privileges bring responsibilities, and before women clamor for more work to do, it were better that they should attend more thoughtfully to the duties which lie all about them, in the home and social circle. Until society is cleansed of the moral foulness which infests it, which, as we have seen, lies beyond the reach of civil law, women have no call to go forth into wider fields, claiming to be therein the rightful and natural purifiers. Let them first make the home sweet and pure, and the streams which flow therefrom will sweeten and purify all the rest.

As between the power of the ballot and this moral force exerted by women there cannot be an instant's doubt as to the choice. Nor is it very plain to be seen how women can yield both. It is a question of having your cake and eating it too. In natural refinement and elevation of character the ideal woman stands a step above the ideal man. If she descends from this fortunate position to take part in the coarse scramble for material power, what chance will she have as against man's aggressive forces; and what can she possibly gain that she cannot win more directly, more effectually, and with far more dignity and glory to herself by the exercise of her own womanly prerogatives? She has, under God, the formation and rearing of men in her own hands. If they do not turn out in the end to be men who respect woman, who will protect and defend her in the exercise of every one of her God-given rights, it is because she has failed in her duty toward them; has not been taught to comprehend her own power and to use it to its best ends. For women to seek to control men by the power of suffrage is like David essaying the armor of Saul. What woman needs is her own sheepskin sling and her few smooth pebbles from the bed of the brook, and then go forth in the name of the Lord God of Hosts, and a victory as sure and decisive as that of the shepherd of Israel awaits her.

Again, in Chapter 4, entitled, "The power of the home," the author says:

It is perhaps of minor consequence that women should have felt themselves emancipated from buttons and bread-making; but that they should have learned to look in the least degree slightingly upon the great duties of women as lovers of husbands, as lovers of children, as the fountain and source of what is highest and purest and holiest, and not less of what is homely and comfortable and satisfying in the home, is a serious misfortune. Women can hardly be said to have lost, perhaps what they have so rarely in any age generally attained, that dignity which knows how to command, united with a sweetness which seems all the while to be complying; the power, supple and strong, which rescues the character of the ideal woman from the charge of weakness, and at the same time exhibits its utmost of grace and fascination. But that of late years the gift has not been cultivated, has not, in fact, thrown out such natural off-shoots as gave grace and glory to some earlier social epochs, must be evident, it would seem, to any thoughtful observer.

If, instead of striving to grasp more material power, women would pursue those studies

and investigations which tend to make them familiar with what science teaches concerning the influence of the mother and the home upon the child, of how completely the Creator in giving the genesis of the human race into the hands of woman, has made her not only capable of, but responsible for, upon the regeneration of the world; if they would reflect that nature by making man the bond-slave of his passions, has put the lever in the hands of woman by which she may control him, and if they would learn to use these powers not as bad women do, for vile and selfish ends, but as the mothers of the race ought, for pure and holy, and redemptive purposes, then would the sphere of women be enlarged to some purpose; the atmosphere of the home would be purified and vitalized, and the work of redeeming man from his vices would be hopefully begun.

From Chapter 1 we make the following extract:

Is this emancipation of woman, if that is the proper phrase for it, a final end, or only the means to an end? Are women to be as the outcome of it emancipated from their world-old "sphere" of marriage and motherhood and control of the moral and spiritual destinies of the race, or are they to be emancipated, in order to the proper fulfillment of these functions? It would seem that most of the advanced women of the day would answer the first of these questions affirmatively. Women, I think it has been authoritatively stated, are to be emancipated in order that they may become fully developed human beings, something broader and stronger, something higher and finer, more delicate, more aesthetic, more generally rarefied and sublimated than the old-fashioned type of womanhood, the wife and mother. And the result of the woman movement seems more or less in a line thus far with this theoretic aim. Of advanced women, a less proportion are inclined to marry than of the old-fashioned type; of these who do marry, a great proportion are restless in marriage bonds or seek release from them, while of those who do remain in married life, many bear no children, and few indeed become mothers of large families. The woman's vitality is concentrated in the brain, and fructifies more in intellectual than physical forms. Now women who do not marry are one of two things, either they belong to a class which we shrink from naming, o they become old maids. An old maid may be in herself a very useful and commendable person, a valuable member of society—many are all this—but she has still this sad drawback, she cannot perpetuate herself; and since all history and observation go to prove that the great final end of creation, whatever it may be, can only be achieved through the perpetuity and increasing progress of the race, it follows that unmarried woman is not the most necessary, the indispensable type of woman. If there were no other class of females left upon the earth but the women who do not bear children, then the world would be a failure, creation would be nonplussed.

If, then, the movement for the emancipation of woman has for its final end the making of never so fine a quality, never so sublimated a sort of non-child-bearing women, it is an absurdity upon the face of it.

From the standpoint of the Chimney Corner, i appears that too many even of the most gifted and liberal minded of the leaders in the woman's rights movement have not yet discovered this flaw in their logic. They seek to individualize women, not seeing apparently that individualized women, old maids, and individualized men, old bachelors, though they may be useful in certain minor ways, are, after all, to speak with the relentlessness of science, fragmentary and abortive so far as the great scheme of the universe is concerned, and often become in addition seriously detrimental to the right progress of society. The man and woman united in marriage form the unit of the race; they alone rightly wield the self-perpetuating power upon which all human progress depends; without which the race itself must perish, the universe become null.

Reaching this point of the argument, it becomes evident that while the development of the individual man or individual woman is no doubt of great importance, since, as Margaret Fuller has justly said, "There must be units before there can be union," it is chiefly so because of their relation to each other. Their characters should be developed with a view to their future union with each other, and not to be independent of it. When the leaders of the woman's movement fully realize this, and shape their course accordingly, they will have made a great advance, both in the value of their work and in its claim upon public sympathy. Moreover, they will have reached a point from which it will be possible for them to investigate, reform and idealize the relations existing between men and women, as it is now impossible for them to do, and to meet in a practical manner the question which more than all others appalls the philanthropist and staggers the practical reformer, namely, the prevention and cure of licentiousness.

We make a few additional quotations from the appendix, entitled, "The relation of woman to the state; practical suggestions."

A publication of the foregoing letters in the Chicago Inter-Ocean brought out so many protests from the women suffragists that in submitting the letters to the public

the writer feels constrained to add a few words concerning what appears to her to be the true place of woman in the state.

To say that the power of woman is essentially a moral one does not necessarily imply that all women are more moral than all men, nor even that in any given community a majority of women, if allowed to vote, would be found upon the side of measures proposed in the interest of abstract moral excellence. In most communities, notably in large cities, where prostitutes abound, and where thieves and gamblers and saloon keepers, and the vicious classes generally have their multitude of female adherents, and where, on the other hand, frivolity and the fashionable forms of vice absorb so many women, it may well be doubted if upon any great moral question the majority of women would be found on the side of even practical morality.

One strong assertion—it can hardly be called an argument—of the women suffragists is, that if the wives and mothers of any community were allowed to vote they would close saloons, brothels, and gambling houses. But setting aside the question of whether the absolute closing of these places would be, on the whole, a gain to society in its present condition of impurity; whether the best that can be done is not to heal the open ulcer, which indicates and at the same time gives relief to the infamous disease within, but rather so to restrain and circumscribe it that it may not spread the plague by its foul inoculation. Setting this question wholly aside, it is by no means clear to the minds of some who have given the matter deep and prayerful consideration, that the majority of all the women of any community in which vice is openly rampant would vote for such suppression. The good wives and mothers, the pure and true women generally, of any community are, indeed, invested with a moral force, which, if intelligently wielded, is well nigh supreme; but it is not a force of numbers, like that which prevails in the political world. As a voter, a good woman has no more power in the state than a bad one. At the polls the woman of gifts, culture, of eminent social position, puts herself upon an absolute equality with the vilest drab in the streets. This fact, as expressed in manhood suffrage—the absolute political equality of all male voters—already constitutes in the eyes of many wise statesmen an imminent and deadly peril to the Republic; a peril which would not be in any wise lessened, but greatly complicated by the admission of all women to the privilege of the ballot. In England, where suffrage is bestowed by classes, the force of this objection is greatly diminished. Much as some female leaders of opinion in that country may desire the parliamentary vote for themselves, I greatly doubt if they would rejoice to see it bestowed upon the women of St. Giles and Billingsgate.

Ought then this moral power, which resides in the good and true women of any community, to be excluded from influence upon the state? By no means. Probably few women have deeper, more positive, or more earnest convictions upon this subject than the writer of these lines. But let us examine briefly the foundations upon which the state rests.

One of the wisest and purest of European republicans, Joseph Mazzini, is recorded as believing that not right, but duty, is the watchword of human progress. Not an unconditional liberty is the foundation of a true state, but the restrained and orderly exercise of proper individual prerogatives.

Long before you can predicate political duties for woman, you must recognize her duty as wife and mother; as the queen regnant of the home, as the fountain of order, justice, virtue, and charity, the giver of life, and the former of character for future generations. Heaven's supreme excellences center around and find their best earthly expression in the ideal woman and her work.

To this high office, the duty of man is subordinate. He is to furnish the material supplies by means of which the great work of re-creation may be carried on. It is his duty to support the family by his labor, to give it the strength of his counsels, and the protection of his valor. Few women who are good, and true, and faithful mothers, would not resent the idea that it was their duty, also, to furnish the material supplies which nourish the outward form or body of the home.

"No," they would say, and say rightly; "We peril our lives for our children, we give our days and nights to care and anxiety, to burdens of pain and perplexity, which men know nothing of. It is their duty to minister to the material necessities of ourselves and our children, without toil or trouble on our part."

Let us carry a similar division of labor into the state. Does not the voice of the true woman respond, "We furnish citizens, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; we train them up to manhood in all manly, noble virtues; we give them our patience, our faith, our watchfulness, our prayers, and it is little to ask in return that the state, which is managed by them, shall be just and impartial, nay, generous and munificent, to us, who trust our all in their hands." As a matter of fact, women have too seldom put forth such appeals as this, but whenever and wherever they have done so, at least in this American Republic, they have always found a respectful hearing and a generous response; and the simple and sole reason why women are not endowed with suffrage to-day is, that the majority of the wives and mothers, and good women generally, of this land, have never asked for nor desired it.

Civil law is the growth of the ages, and, like all other immemorial institutions, it cherishes many imperfections; but these are being removed as rapidly, perhaps, as is consistent with true progress. That there still remain laws upon the statute books which are relics of barbarism, and bear hardly upon woman, is true enough; but let the women of any community unite to define these wrongs and suggest the redress, and there will be no difficulty in obtaining it, not in spite of men, but by means of them. If a woman wants a new house she does not go at work with a pick and spade and trowel to build it herself; she simply sets the men about it, and if she is worthy of a home at all, she has her parlor and kitchen and closets just where she wants them, too. If she desires civil or political improvements, let her go about the work in the same fashion.

It is this united action, the inspiration coming from women, the execution from men, and the two forces working harmoniously and lovingly together, not pulling awkwardly and angrily apart, that is destined to save the state and save the world.

The above quotations, from the valuable little book already mentioned by our gifted authoress, are so appropriate, so well and so forcibly expressed, that we cheerfully, as already stated, substitute them in place of any production of our own, and respectfully commend them to the Senate and to the country as worthy of careful consideration and reflection.

We also append hereto the minority report submitted by the undersigned in the Forty-eighth Congress.

JOSEPH E. BROWN.
F. M. COCKRELL.

[Senate Report No. 399, Part 2, Forty-eighth Congress, first session.]

The undersigned minority of the Committee of the Senate on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred S. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, granting the right to vote to the women of the United States, beg leave to submit the following report:

The undersigned believe that the Creator intended that the sphere of the males and females of our race should be different, and that their duties and obligations, while they differ materially, are equally important and equally honorable, and that each sex is equally well qualified by natural endowments for the discharge of the important duties which pertain to each, and that each sex is equally competent to discharge those duties.

We find an abundance of evidence both in the works of nature and in the Divine revelation to establish the fact that the family properly regulated is the foundation and pillar of society, and is the most important of any other human institution.

In the Divine economy it is provided that the man shall be the head of the family, and shall take upon himself the solemn obligation of providing for and protecting the family.

Man, by reason of his physical strength, and his other endowments and faculties, is qualified for the discharge of those duties that require strength and ability to combat with the sterner realities and difficulties of life. The different classes of outdoor labor, which require physical strength and endurance, are by nature assigned to man, the head of the family, as part of his task. He discharges such labors as require greater physical endurance and strength than the female sex are usually found to possess. It is not only his duty to provide for and protect the family, but as a member of the community it is also his duty to discharge the laborious and responsible obligations which the family owe to the State, and which obligation must be discharged by the head of the family, until the male members of the family have grown up to manhood and are able to aid in the discharge of those obligations, when it becomes their duty in their turn to take charge of and rear each a family, for which he is responsible.

Among other duties which the head of the family owes to the state is military duty in time of war, which he, when able-bodied, is able to discharge, and which the female members of the family are unable to discharge.

He is also under obligation to discharge jury duty, and by himself or his representative to discharge his part of the labor necessary to construct and keep in proper order roads, bridges, streets, and all grades of public highways. And in this progressive age upon the male sex is devolved the duty of constructing our railroads, and the

engines and other rolling-stock with which they are operated, of building, equipping, and launching shipping and other water crafts of every character necessary for the transportation of passengers and freight upon our rivers, our lakes, and upon the high seas.

The labor in our fields, sowing, cultivating, and reaping crops must be discharged mainly by the male sex, as the female sex, for want of physical strength, are generally unable to discharge these duties.

As it is the duty of the male sex to perform the obligations to the state, to society, and to the family, already mentioned, with numerous others that might be enumerated, it is also their duty to aid in the government of the state, which is simply a great aggregation of families. Society cannot be preserved nor can the people be prosperous without good government. The Government of our country is a government of the people, and it becomes necessary that that class of people upon whom the responsibility rests should assemble together and consider and discuss the great questions of governmental policy which from time to time are presented for their decision. This often requires the assembling of caucuses in the night-time as well as public assemblages in the day-time. It is a laborious task for which the male sex is infinitely better fitted than the female sex, and after proper consideration and discussion of the measures that may divide the country from time to time, the duty devolves upon those who are responsible for the Government, at times and places to be fixed by law, to meet and by the ballot to decide the great questions of government upon which the prosperity of the country depends. These are some of the active and sterner duties of life to which the male sex is by nature better fitted than the female sex. If in carrying out the policy of the state on great measures adjudged vital, such policy should lead to war, either foreign or domestic, it would seem to follow very naturally that those who have been responsible for the management of the state should be the parties to take the hazards and hardships of the struggle.

Here, again, man is fitted by nature for the discharge of the duty—woman is unfit for it. So much for some of the duties imposed upon the male sex, for the discharge of which the Creator has endowed them with proper strength and faculties.

On the other hand, the Creator has assigned to woman very laborious and responsible duties, by no means less important than those imposed upon the male sex, though entirely different in their character. In the family she is a queen. She alone is fitted for the discharge of the sacred trust of wife and the endearing relation of mother. While the man is contending with the sterner duties of life, the whole time of the noble, affectionate, and true woman is required in the discharge of the delicate and difficult duties assigned her in the family circle, in her church relations, and in the society where her lot is cast. When the husband returns home weary and worn in the discharge of the difficult and laborious task assigned him, he finds in the good wife solace and consolation which is nowhere else afforded. If he is despondent and distressed, she cheers his heart with words of kindness; if he is sick or languishing, she soothes, comforts, and administers to him as no one but an affectionate wife can do. If his burdens are onerous, she divides their weight by the exercise of her love and her sympathy.

But a still more important duty devolves upon the mother. After having brought into existence the offspring of the nuptial union, the children are dependent upon the mother as they are not upon any other human being. The trust is a most sacred, most responsible, and most important one. To watch over them in their infancy, and, as the mind begins to expand, to train, direct, and educate it into the paths of virtue and usefulness, is the high trust assigned to the mother. She trains the twig as the tree should be inclined. She molds the character. She educates the heart as well as the intellect, and she prepares the future man, now the boy, for honor or dishonor. Upon the manner in which she discharges her duty depends the fact whether he shall in future be a useful citizen or a burden to society. She inculcates lessons of patriotism, manliness, religion, and virtue, fitting the man by reason of his training to be an ornament to society, or dooming him by her neglect to a life of dishonor and shame. Society acts unwisely when it imposes upon her the duties that by common consent have always been assigned to the sterner and stronger sex, and the discharge of which causes her to neglect those sacred and all-important duties to her children, and to the society of which they are members.

In the church, by her piety, her charity, and her Christian purity she not only aids society by a proper training of her own children, but the children of others, whom she encourages to come to the sacred altar, are taught to walk in the paths of rectitude, honor, and religion. In the Sunday-school room the good woman is a princess, and she exerts an influence which purifies and ennobles society, training the young in the truths of religion, making the Sunday-school the nursery of the church and elevating society to the higher planes of pure religion, virtue, and patriotism.

In the sick room and among the humble, the poor, and the suffering, the good woman, like an angel of light, cheers the hearts and revives the hopes of the poor, the suffering, and the despondent.

It would be a vain attempt to undertake to enumerate the refining, endearing, and ennobling influences exercised by the true woman in her relations to the family and to society when she occupies the sphere assigned her by the laws of nature and the Divine inspiration, which are our surest guide for the present and the future life. But how can woman be expected to meet these heavy responsibilities and to discharge these delicate and most important duties of wife, Christian, teacher, minister of mercy, friend of the suffering, and consoler of the despondent and the needy, if we impose upon her the grosser, rougher, and harsher duties which nature has assigned to the male sex?

If the wife and the mother is required to leave the sacred precincts of home, and to attempt to do military duty when the state is in peril, or if she is to be required to leave her home from day to day in attendance upon the court as a juror, and to be shut up in the jury-room from night to night, with men who are strangers, while a question of life or property is being considered, if she is to attend political meetings, take part in political discussions, and mingle with the male sex at political gatherings, if she is to become an active politician, if she is to attend political caucuses at late hours of the night, if she is to take part in all the unsavory work that may be deemed necessary for the triumph of her party, and if on election day she is to leave her home and go upon the streets electioneering for votes for the candidates who receive her support, and mingling among the crowds of men who gather around the polls, she is to press her way through them to the ballot-box and deposit her suffrage, if she is to take part in the corporate struggles of the city or town in which she resides, attend to the duties of his honor the mayor, of councilman, or of policeman, to say nothing of the many other like obligations which are disagreeable even to the male sex, how is she, with all these heavy duties of citizen, politician, and office-holder resting upon her shoulders, to attend to the more sacred, delicate, and refining trust to which we have already referred, and for which she is peculiarly fitted by nature? If she is to discharge the duties last mentioned, how is she, in connection with them, to discharge the more refining, elevating, and ennobling duties of wife, mother, Christian, and friend, which are found in the sphere were nature has placed her?

Who is to care for and train the children while she is absent in the discharge of these masculine duties?

If it were proper to reverse the order of nature and assign woman to the sterner duties devolved upon the male sex and to attempt to assign man to the more refining, delicate, and ennobling duties of the woman, man would be found entirely incompetent to the discharge of the obligations which nature has devolved upon the gentler sex, and society must be greatly injured by the attempted change. But if we are told that the object of this movement is not to reverse this order of nature, but only to devolve upon the gentler sex a portion of the more rigorous duties imposed by nature upon the stronger sex, we reply that society must be injured, as the woman would not be able to discharge those duties so well, by reason of her want of physical strength, as the male, upon whom they are devolved, and to the extent that the duties are to be divided the male would be infinitely less competent to discharge the delicate and sacred trusts which nature has assigned to the female.

But it has been said that the present law is unjust to woman; that she is often required to pay taxes on property she holds without being permitted to take part in framing or administering the laws by which her property is governed, and that she is taxed without representation. That is a great mistake.

It may be very doubtful whether the male or the female sex, in the present state of things, has more influence in the administration of the affairs of the Government, and the enactment of the laws by which we are governed.

While the woman does not discharge military duty, nor does she attend courts and serve on juries, nor does she labor upon the public streets, bridges, or highways, nor does she engage actively and publicly in the discussion of political affairs, nor does she enter the crowded precincts of the ballot-box to deposit her suffrage, still the intelligent, cultivated, noble woman is a power behind the throne. All her influence is in favor of morality, justice, and fair dealing; all her efforts and her counsel are in favor of good government, wise and wholesome regulations, and a faithful administration of the laws. Such a woman, by her gentleness, kindness, and Christian bearing, impresses her views and her counsels upon her father, her husband, her brothers, her sons, and her other male friends, who imperceptibly yield to her influence many times, without even being conscious of it. She rules not with a rod of iron, but with the queenly scepter; she binds not with hooks of steel, but with silken cords; she governs not by physical efforts, but by moral suasion and feminine purity and delicacy. Her dominion is one of love, not of arbitrary power.

We are satisfied, therefore, that the pure, cultivated, and pious ladies of this country now exercise a very powerful but quiet, imperceptible influence in popular affairs, much greater than they will ever again exercise if female suffrage should be enacted

and they should be compelled actively to take part in the affairs of state and the corruptions of party politics.

It would be a gratification, and we are always glad to see the ladies gratified, to many who have espoused the cause of woman suffrage if they could take active part in political affairs, and go to the polls and cast their votes alongside the male sex; but while this would be a gratification to a large number of very worthy and excellent ladies, who take a different view of the question from that which we entertain, we feel that it would be a great cruelty to a much larger number of the cultivated, refined, delicate, and lovely women of this country who seek no such distinction, who would enjoy no such privilege, who would with woman-like delicacy shrink from the discharge of any such obligation, and who would sincerely regret that what they consider the folly of the state had imposed upon them any such unpleasant duties.

But should female suffrage be once established it would become an imperative necessity that the very large class, indeed much the largest class, of the women of this country, of the character last described, should yield, contrary to their inclinations and their wishes, to the necessity which would compel them to engage in political strife. We apprehend no one who has properly considered this question will doubt, if female suffrage should be established, that the more ignorant and less refined portions of the female population of this country, to say nothing of the baser class of females, laying aside female delicacy, and disregarding the sacred duties devolving upon them to which we have already referred, would rush to the polls and take pleasure in the crowded association which the situation would compel of the two sexes in political meetings and at the ballot-box.

If all the baser and all the more ignorant portion of the female sex crowd to the polls and deposit their suffrage, this compels the very large class of intelligent, virtuous, and refined females, including the wives and mothers who have much more important duties to perform, to leave their sacred labors at home, relinquishing for a time the God-giving important trust which has been placed in their hands, to go contrary to their wishes to the polls and vote, to counteract the suffrage of the less worthy class of our female population.

If they fail to do this the best interests of the country must suffer.

It is now a problem which perplexes the brain of the ablest statesman to determine how we will best preserve our republican system as against the demoralizing influence of the large class of our present citizens and voters, who, by reason of their illiteracy, are unable to read or write the ballot they cast.

Certainly no statesman who has carefully observed the situation would desire to add very largely to this burden of ignorance. But who does not apprehend the fact if universal female suffrage should be established that we will, especially in the Southern States, add a very large number to the voting population whose ignorance utterly disqualifies them to discharge the trust. If our colored population, who were so recently slaves that even the males who are voters have had but little opportunity to educate themselves, or to be educated, whose ignorance is now exciting the liveliest interest of our statesmen, are causes of serious apprehension, what is to be said in favor of adding to the voting population all the females of that race, who, on account of the situation in which they have been placed, have had much less opportunity to be educated than even the males of their own race? We do not say it is their fault that they are not educated; but the fact is undeniable that they are grossly ignorant, with very few exceptions, and probably not one in a hundred of them could read and write the ballot they would be authorized to cast. What says the statesman to the propriety of adding this immense mass of ignorance to the voting population of the Union in its present condition?

It may be said that their votes could be offset by the ballots of the educated and refined ladies of the white race in the same section, but who does not know that the ignorant voters would be at the polls *en masse*, while the refined and educated, shrinking from public contact on such occasions, would remain at home and attend to their domestic and other important duties, leaving the country to the control of those who could afford, under the circumstances, to take part in the strifes or politics, and to come in contact with the unpleasant surroundings before they could reach the polls.

Are we ready to expose the country to the demoralization, and our institutions to the strain, which would thus be placed upon them, for the gratification of a minority of the virtuous and the good of our female population, at the expense of the mortification of a much larger majority of the same class?

It has been frequently urged with great earnestness by those who advocate woman suffrage that the ballot is necessary to the women to enable them to protect themselves in securing occupations, and to enable them to realize the same compensation for the like labor which is received by men. This argument is plausible, but upon a closer examination it will be found to possess but little real force. The price of labor is, and must continue to be, governed by the law of supply and demand; and the person who has the most physical strength to labor, and the most pursuits requiring such strength open for employment, will always command the higher prices.

Ladies make excellent teachers in the public schools; many of them are every way the equals of their male competitors, and still they secure less wages than males. The reason is obvious. The number of ladies who offer themselves as teachers is much larger than the number of males who are willing to teach. The larger number of females offer to teach because other occupations are not open to them. The smaller number of males offer to teach because other more profitable occupations are open to most males who are competent to teach. The result is that the competition for positions of teachers to be filled by ladies is so great as to reduce the price, but as males cannot be employed at that price, and are necessary in certain places in the schools, those seeking their services have to pay a higher rate for them. Persons having a larger number of places open to them with fewer competitors command higher wages than those who have a smaller number of places open to them with more competitors. This is the law of society. It is the law of supply and demand, which cannot be changed by legislation.

Then it follows that the ballot cannot enable those who have to compete with the larger number to command the same prices as those who compete with the smaller number in the labor market. As the legislature has no power to regulate in practice that of which the advocates of female suffrage complain the ballot in the hands of females could not aid its regulation. The ballot cannot impart to the female physical strength which she does not possess, nor can it open to her pursuits which she does not have physical ability to engage in; and as long as she lacks the physical strength to compete with men in the different departments of labor there will be more competition in her department, and she must necessarily receive less wages.

But it is claimed again that females should have the ballot as a protection against the tyranny of bad husbands. This is also delusive. If the husband is brutal, arbitrary, or tyrannical, and tyrannizes over her at home, the ballot in her hands would be no protection against such injustice, but the husband who compelled her to conform to his wishes in other respects would also compel her to use the ballot if she possessed it, as he might please to dictate. The ballot could therefore be of no assistance to the wife in such case, nor could it heal family strifes or dissensions. On the contrary, one of the gravest objections to placing the ballot in the hands of the female sex is that it would promote unhappiness and dissensions in the family circle. There should be unity in the family.

At present the man represents the family in meeting the demands of the law and of society upon the family. So far as the rougher, coarser duties are concerned, the man represents the family, and the individuality of the woman is not brought into prominence, but when the ballot is placed in the hands of the woman her individuality is enlarged and she is expected to answer for herself the demands of the law and of society on her individual account, and not as the weaker member of the family to answer by her husband. This naturally draws her out from the dignified and cultivated refinement of her womanly position, and brings her into a closer contact with the rougher elements of society, which tends to destroy that higher reverence and respect which her refinement and dignity in the relation of wife and mother have always inspired in those who approached her in her useful and honorable retirement.

When she becomes a voter she will be more or less of a politician, and will form political alliances, or unite with political parties, which will frequently be antagonistic to those to which her husband belongs. This will introduce into the family circle new elements of disagreement and discord, which will frequently end in unhappy divisions, if not in separation or divorce. This must frequently occur when she becomes an active politician, identified with a party which is distasteful to her husband. On the other hand, if she unites with her husband in party associations, and votes with him on all occasions, so as not to disturb the harmony and happiness of the family, then the ballot is of no service, as it simply duplicates the vote of the male on each side of the question, and leaves the result the same.

Again, if the family is the unit of society, and the State is composed of an aggregation of families, then it is important to society that there be as many happy families as possible, and it becomes the duty of man and woman alike to unite in the holy relation of matrimony.

As this is the only legal and proper mode of rendering obedience to the early command to multiply and replenish the earth, whatever tends to discourage the holy relation of matrimony, is in disobedience of this command, and any change which encourages such disobedience is violative of the Divine law, and cannot result in advantage to the State. Before forming this relation it is the duty of young men who have to take upon themselves the responsibilities of providing for and protecting the family to select some profession or pursuit that is most congenial to their tastes, and in which they will be most likely to be successful; but this is not permitted to the young ladies, or if permitted, it cannot be practically carried out after matrimony. As it might frequently happen that the young man had selected one profession or pursuit and the young lady another; the result would be that after marriage she must drop the profession or pursuit of her choice and employ herself in the sacred duties of

ALBERT DURST

wife and mother at home, and in rearing, educating, and elevating the family, while the husband pursues the profession of his choice.

It may be said, however, that there is a class of young ladies who do not choose to marry, and who select professions or avocations and follow them for a livelihood. This is true, but this class compared with the number who unite in matrimony with the husbands of their choice is comparatively very small; and it is the duty of society to encourage the increase of marriages rather than of celibacy. If the larger number of females select pursuits or professions which require them to decline marriage, society to that extent is deprived of the advantages resulting from the increase of population by marriage.

It is said by those who have examined the question closely that the largest number of divorces is now found in the communities where the advocates of female suffrage are most numerous, and where the individuality of woman as related to her husband, which such a doctrine inculcates, is increased to the greatest extent. If this be true, and it seems to be well authenticated, it is a strong plea in the interest of the family and of society against granting the petition of the advocates of woman suffrage. After all, this is a local question, which properly belongs to the different States of the Union, each acting for itself, and to the Territories of the Union, when not acting in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The fact that a State adopts the rule of female suffrage neither increases nor diminishes its power in the Union, as the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled, and the number of members of the electoral college appointed by each, is determined by its aggregate population, and not by the proportion of its voting population, so long as no race or class is excluded from the exercise of the right of suffrage.

While the undersigned would vote against female suffrage if the question were to arise in their respective States, they admit the power of the States over the subject-matter. Entertaining these views, they protest against a constitutional amendment which would confer the right of female suffrage in all parts of the Union, without regard to the wishes of the different States at any time after the adoption of the said amendment. They believe that the noble, true, good women of the country should be heard, and as an expression of their views there is hereto appended "Woman's Protest against Woman Suffrage," known as the Lorain Memorial against Woman Suffrage, presented to the Ohio legislature and signed by a large number of the most thoughtful and intelligent women of the cities of Oberlin and Elyria, Ohio, including lady teachers and wives of professors in Oberlin College.

JOSEPH E. BROWN.
F. M. COCKRELL.

WOMAN'S PROTEST AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

We acknowledge no inferiority to men. We claim to have no less ability to perform the duties which God has imposed upon us than they have to perform those imposed upon them.

We believe that God has wisely and well adapted each sex to the proper performance of the duties of each.

We believe our trusts to be as important and sacred as any that exist on earth.

We believe woman suffrage would relatively lessen the influence of the intelligent and true, and increase the influence of the ignorant and vicious.

We feel that our present duties fill up the whole measure of our time and ability, and are such as none but ourselves can perform. Our appreciation of their importance requires us to protest against all efforts to infringe upon our rights by imposing upon us those obligations which cannot be separated from suffrage, but which, as we think, cannot be performed by us without the sacrifice of the highest interests of our families and of society.

It is our fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons who represent us at the ballot-box. Our fathers and our brothers love us; our husbands are our choice and one with us; our sons are what *we make them*. We are content that they represent *us* in the cornfield, on the battle-field, and at the ballot-box, and we *them* in the school-room, at the fireside, and at the cradle, believing our representation even at the ballot-box to be thus more full and impartial than it would be were the views of the few who wish suffrage adopted, contrary to the judgment of the many.

We do therefore respectfully protest against any legislation to establish "woman suffrage" in our land, or in any part of it.

SEYMOUR DURST